

REMARKS

Claims 1, 13, 19, 35, 37, 38, 39 and 53 have been amended, and claims 34 and 52 have been canceled. Claims 1-33, 35-51 and 53-54 are pending in the application. Reconsideration is respectfully requested in light of the following remarks.

Section 103(a) Rejections:

The Examiner rejected claims 1-11, 16-29, 34-39 and 52-54 under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hermann et al. (U.S. Patent 6,633,757) (hereinafter “Hermann”) in view of Humpleman et al. (U.S. Patent 7,043,532) (hereinafter “Humpleman”), and claims 12-15, 30-33 and 50-51 as being unpatentable over Hermann in view of Humpleman and further in view of Gruse et al. (U.S. patent 6,398,245) (hereinafter “Gruse”). Applicants respectfully traverse this rejection for at least the following reasons.

Regarding claim 1, Hermann in view of Humpleman and Gruse fails to teach or suggest that using the information from the document to access the service comprises a client on the client device requesting a security credential from an authentication service specified in the document. The Examiner, regarding the rejection of claim 13, contends that Gruse teaches the client requesting a security credential from an authentication service specified in the document and cites column 19, lines 10-45 of Gruse. However, Gruse, whether considered singly or in combination with the other cited art, does not describe anything about a client request a security credential from an authentication service specified in a document that the client requested directly from a service device and where the document also comprises information describing how to access the service.

Gruse, at the Examiner’s cited passage, describes use of a security container (SC) used to communicate encrypted information between devices. Regarding a client requesting a security credential, Gruse states that a “[s]ender must have obtained the

certificate from a certification authority prior to initiating secure communications” and also describes that the certificate authority will include the sender’s public key and name in the certificate (Gruse, column 19, lines 39-44). The sender then transmits a secure container containing the certificate to the recipient. However, Gruse’s system does not involve, either explicitly or implicitly, a client obtaining from a service device a document describing how to access a service provided by the service device and then requesting a security credential from an authentication service *specified in the document*. In fact, Gruse makes no statement at all about how a client discovers a certification authority from which to request a security credential.

Furthermore, neither Hermann nor Humpleman, whether considered singly or in combination with the other cited art, teaches or suggests anything about a client requesting a security credential from an authentication service specified in the document. Thus, Hermann, Humpleman and Gruse, whether considered alone or in combination, fail to teach or suggest this limitation of claim 1.

Thus, for at least the reasons above, the rejection of claim 1 is not supported by the cited art. Similar remarks also apply to claim 37.

In regards to claim 19, contrary to the Examiner’s assertion, Hermann in view of Humpleman fails to teach or suggest that the client device is further configured to support a transport connection in addition to said direct point-to-point communication link, wherein said client device is further configured to make said document available to other devices over said transport connection and provide a bridge from said transport connection to said direct point-to-point communication link so that the other devices may access the service. The Examiner, regarding claim 16, relies on Hermann and cites column 14, lines 30-54. However, Hermann, whether considered singly or in combination with the other cited art, does not teach or suggest anything regarding a client making the document available to other devices of a transport

connection and providing a bridge from the transport connection to the direct point-to-point communication link so that other device may access the service.

At the Examiner's cited passage, Hermann describes that a service-providing device may offer both services of its own (i.e., native services) and composite services that are provided by a combination service-providing devices. However, no mention is made of a client device making a document, which describes an interface to access a service, available to other devices. Nor does Hermann describe a client providing a bridge between a transport connection and a direct point-to-point communication link so that the other devices may access the service. Hermann's composite services involves multiple service device acting in a coordinated manner to perform a composite service for a client (see, column 9, lines 16-31).

Multiple service devices coordinating to provide a composite service to a client is very different from a client providing a bridge from a transport connection to a direct point-to-point communication link so that the other devices may access a service. First of all, Hermann's composite services involve multiple *service* devices, not *client* devices, communicating and coordinating to provide a service and secondly, Hermann's composite services do not involve any sort of bridge from a transport connection to a direct point-to-point communication link.

Additionally, the Examiner's other cited art, when considered in combination with Hermann, also fails to teach or suggest this limitation of claim 19. Thus, for at least the reasons above, the rejection of claim 19 is not supported by the cited art and removal thereof is respectfully requested. Similar remarks also apply to claim 39.

Regarding claim 38, Hermann in view of Humpleman and Gruse fails to teach or suggest a service device comprising an interface configured to receive over the point-to-point communication link a request from a client for a document that describes an interface to access the service, where the interface is further configured

to provide the document directly to the client over the point-to-point communication link; and an authentication service configured to receive a request from the client for a security credential. The Examiner, regarding claim 15, cites column 19, lines 10-45 of Gruse. However, Gruse does not, either at the cited passage or elsewhere, even if considered in view of the other cited art, describe a service device configured to: receive a request from a client for a document that describes an interface to access a service, provide the document directly to the client and that also includes an authentication service configured to receive a request from the client for a security credential. Instead, the cited passage, as noted above, describes use of a security container (SC) used to communicate encrypted information between devices. Regarding a client requesting a security credential, Gruse states that a “[s]ender must have obtained the certificate from a certification authority prior to initiating secure communications” and also describes that the certificate authority will include the sender’s public key and name in the certificate (Gruse, column 19, lines 39-44). The sender then transmits a secure container containing the certificate to the recipient.

Gruse’s security containers and security certificates, even if combined with Hermann’s and Humpleman’s service devices, are not obtained from the service device providing the document describing an interface to access the service. Instead, a combination of Gruse, Hermann and Humpleman would require a client device to first obtain a certificate from a certification authority and then include that certificate in communication with service devices. None of the Examiner’s cited art, whether considered singly or in combination teaches or suggests a service device providing a document that describes an interface to the service *and* providing an authentication service configured to receive a request from a client for a security credential.

Thus, for at least the reasons above, the rejection of claim 38 is not supported by the cited art and removal thereof is respectfully requested.

Applicant also asserts that numerous ones of the dependent claims recite further distinctions over the cited art. However, since the rejections have been shown to be unsupported for the independent claims, a further discussion of the dependent claims is not necessary at this time.

CONCLUSION

Applicants submit the application is in condition for allowance, and prompt notice to that effect is respectfully requested.

If any extension of time (under 37 C.F.R. § 1.136) is necessary to prevent the above-referenced application from becoming abandoned, Applicants hereby petition for such an extension. If any fees are due, the Commissioner is authorized to charge said fees to Meyertons, Hood, Kivlin, Kowert, & Goetzel, P.C. Deposit Account No. 501505/5181-72300/RCK.

Also enclosed herewith are the following items:

- ☐ Return Receipt Postcard
- ☐ Petition for Extension of Time
- ☐ Notice of Change of Address
- ☐ Other:

Respectfully submitted,

/Robert C. Kowert/
Robert C. Kowert, Reg. #39,255
Attorney for Applicants

Meyertons, Hood, Kivlin, Kowert, & Goetzel, P.C.
P.O. Box 398
Austin, TX 78767-0398
Phone: (512) 853-8850

Date: January 31, 2007